

REMARKS

Applicants are adding new claim 20 to better describe the claimed invention. Thus, claims 1, 4-8, and 10-20 currently are pending and are subject to examination in the above-captioned patent application. No new matter is added by the foregoing amendments, and these amendments are fully supported by the specification. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider the above-captioned patent application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 4-8, and 10-13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as allegedly being rendered obvious by U.S. Patent No. 5,452,004 to Roberts. The Examiner also rejected claims 14-16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as allegedly being rendered obvious by Roberts in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,827,348 to Ernest et al. ("Ernest"). Moreover, the Examiner rejected claims 17-19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as allegedly being rendered obvious by Roberts in view of Ernest and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,382,974 to Soeda et al. ("Soeda"). To the extent that these rejections remain applicable in view of the foregoing amendments, Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections, as follows.

a. Independent Claims 1 and 14

In order for the Examiner to establish a prima facie case for obviousness, three (3) criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to those of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the primary reference as the Examiner proposes. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success in connection with the Examiner's

proposed combination of the references. And third, the prior art references must disclose or suggest all of the claim limitations. MPEP 2143. Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner fails to satisfy his burden of establishing a prima facie case for obviousness because the Examiner fails to show that Roberts, or the combination of Roberts and Ernest discloses or suggests all of the claimed limitations of independent claims 1 and 14.

Applicant's independent claims 1 and 14 each include the limitation of "a reset transistor connected between said cathode and said power source line, and **having a gate connected to an associated reset signal line.**"

In the Office Action, the Examiner asserts that Roberts discloses a reset transistor 70 connected between the cathode and the power source line, and having a gate 68 connected to an associated reset signal line. See, e.g., Office Action, Page 3, Lines 14-16. Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's assertions.

For example, in Roberts, the gate of FET 70 is connected to the output of a NOR gate 64. See, e.g., Roberts, Column 5, Lines 44-46; and Figure 2. As such, the gate of FET 70 is not connected to a reset signal line. Consequently, FET 70 cannot correspond to Applicant's claimed reset transistor, as set forth in independent claims 1 and 14. Moreover, the Examiner does not assert that Ernest, Soeda, or any other reference supplies this missing limitation. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the obviousness rejection of independent claims 1 and 14 at least for this reason.

b. Dependent Claims 4-8, 10-13, and 15-19

Claims 4-8, 10-13, and 15-19 each depend from one of allowable independent claims 1 and 14. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the obviousness rejection of claims 4-8, 10-13, and 15-19 at least for this reason.


c. New, Independent Claim 20

Applicants respectfully submit that new independent claim 20 is allowable at least for the reasons sets forth above with respect to independent claims 1 and 14. Moreover, new independent claim 20 claims a row-by-row nature of an image pickup device. In contrast, Roberts is based on a completely different random access design, and is not compatible with the row-by-row features of independent claim 20. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner allow new independent claim 20.

CONCLUSION

For all of the above reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the claims now pending patentability distinguish the present invention from the cited references. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections and an issuance of a Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner determine that any further action is necessary to place this application into better form, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned representative at the number listed below. In the event this paper is not considered to be timely filed, the Applicants hereby petition for an appropriate extension of time. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fee deficiency or credit any overpayment associated with this communication to Deposit Account No. 01-2300, referencing docket number **107317-00026**.

Respectfully submitted,


Michele L. Connell
Registration No. 52,763

Customer No. 004372
ARENT FOX PLLC
1050 Connecticut Ave., N.W., Suite 400
Washington, D.C. 20036-5339
Telephone No. (202) 857-6104
Facsimile No. (202) 857-6395

WLC/TJC:ksm